

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are pending, Claims 1-3, 7, 9-13, 16, 19-22, and 24 having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; and Claims 1-30 were rejected as being anticipated by Wada (U.S. Patent Publication US 005517618 A).

In reply, the term “fixed” in the claims has been changed to “predetermined”. In reference to Figures 3A-8B, it is shown how the “fixed” bits of the source and destination addresses are converted as the packet is routed through the network. Accordingly, by using the term “predetermined address(es)” it should be clear that the predetermined addresses are addresses within the system.

Applicants traverse the rejection with regard to the use of the term “stations”, “nodes”, and “rank”. The terms “stations” and “nodes” are conventional terms used in communication systems. Accordingly, it is believed that the outstanding Office Action is raising an objection with regard to the term “rank” as it relates to both stations and nodes. However, as is clear from Figure 3 and the corresponding description in the specification, certain mobile stations (e.g., repeating node 40) are associated with particular base stations (in the case of node 40, the base station is base station 50). Therefore, in this non-limiting example the base station 50 is of a higher rank than node 40. Moreover, the use of the term “rank” is believed to be conventional terminology as used in the wireless communication industry. Rank refers to an association of stations and nodes, and it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand this terminology, especially when referring to Figure 3 of the present application and the associated text.

The outstanding Office Action objects to the use of a term “the own...” in the claims. In particular, the outstanding Office Action explains that if “own” refers to the current location of the packet, it is unclear how the address relates to the source and destination addresses of the receive packet and how “converting” is performed in relation to these addresses.

However, it is respectfully submitted that in light of the present specification the use of the term “own” is clear. As an example, in reference to Figure 3, a repeating node “40” converts the fixed address (N00) of the transmission-source address of the received packet into an address (A01) of a node (22). The node (22) has a table (address management table) with an address of a higher-rank station (51) for a last repeating node (41). The replacement of the address is helpful when the address of the higher-rank station (51) of the last repeating node (41) for the destination terminal (31) is not known. In this case, and as would be reflected in Claim 3 as an example, the node (22) that converts its own address (i.e., BS ID: A01) into the address (BS ID:B02) of the higher-rank station (51) for the last repeating node (41).

It is believed that the claims as amended, and in view of the present description, comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. However, if the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim language may be identified.

Claim 1 is rejected over Wada. Claim 1 is directed to a packet communication method that includes steps of making a predetermined number of bits of a transmission-source address and a predetermined number of bits of a destination address predetermined addresses. The method also includes a step of repeating the packet from a transmission-source terminal after first converting the predetermined address of the transmission-source address into an address of a higher-rank station of the repeating node (the term “higher-rank”

meaning that the repeating node is associated with that base station). Lastly, the process includes converting the predetermined address of the destination address of the received packet into an address of a higher-rank station of a last repeating node for a destination terminal, and then transferring the packet.

In contrast, it is respectfully submitted that Wada is directed to a conventional system that converts a destination address of a packet according to a notification given by a gateway at a transmission terminal. Unlike amended Claim 1, Wada does not disclose a predetermined address converted into an address of its own higher-rank station. Once again, as discussed above with regard to what is referred to as a higher-rank station, and in reference to Figure 3, it should be clear that amended Claim 1, includes the feature of converting the predetermined address of the transmission-source address of the receive packet into an address of higher-rank station. Wada is silent with regard to this feature. An advantage of a system according to the invention defined by Claim 1 is that movement control for mobile stations is enabled only from path control within a base station network. Accordingly, traffic does not increase even when a base station to which a mobile station belongs is changed. Wada neither teaches, suggests, nor would offer this advantage.

Because Claims 2-10 depend from Claim 1 it is respectfully submitted that these claims also patentably define over Wada. Similarly, Claim 11 includes a similar converting feature to those discussed above and thus it is respectfully submitted that Claims 11-12 also patentably define over Wada.

Claims 13-16 although of different statutory class and/or scope, contain similar features and therefore also patentably define over Wada.

Claims 17-30, once again although of different statutory class, contain related features regarding the recognition or conversion of higher-ranked stations as discussed above with regard to Claim 1, and therefore are also believed to patentably define over Wada.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-30 as amended, is patently distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

BDL:sjh

I:\atty\BDL\201166US-AM.doc